

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

			<del></del>	
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/680,336	10/07/2003	Chaeyoon Lee	11005-022-999	5439
20583 7:	590 09/01/2004		EXAMINER	
JONES DAY 222 EAST 41S	т ст	KARLSEN, ERNEST F		
NEW YORK, NY 10017			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•			2829	<del></del>
			DATE MAILED: 09/01/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
065 4-45 0	10/680,336	LEE, CHAEYOON				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Ernest F. Karlsen	2829	·Pr			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	Iress			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply if NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	nely filed s will be considered timely, the mailing date of this col D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 Oc	<u>ctober 2003</u> .					
2a)☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)☐ This	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E			merits is			
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 1-27 are subject to restriction and/or expressions.						
Application Papers	_					
	9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti		• •	R 1.121(d).			
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National S	Stage			
Attachment(s)	🗖					
1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) ∐ Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:		-152)			

Page 2

Claims 1-6, drawn to a test contactor, classified in class 324, subclass
 761.

- II. Claims 7-16, drawn to a test printed circuit board for testing a microwave device, classified in class 324, subclass 754.
- III. Claims 17-27, drawn to a method of fabricating a test printed circuit board, classified in class 29, subclass 825.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because:

Inventions III in a first set and I and II in a second set are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the obvious method of making the apparatus of claim 1 is different from the method of Invention III and the method of Invention III does not result in the apparatus of claim 1.

Inventions II and I are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the combination does not require all of the details of the subcombination and at least claim 7 serves as an evidence claim

Art Unit: 2829

that such is the case. The subcombination has separate utility such as by itself for its intended purpose or in a different combination.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

With the election of one of the above inventions further election of species is required as follows:

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

- 1. The species of Figure 2.
- 2. The species of Figure 3.
- 3. The species of Figure 4.
- 4. The species of Figure 5.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, no claim appears to be generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim

Application/Control Number: 10/680,336

Art Unit: 2829

is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless

accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims

are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the

Page 4

elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Ernest F. Karlsen at telephone number 571-272-1961.

Ernest F. Karlsen

August 27, 2004

ERNEST KARLSEN PRIMARY EXAMINER

Tharsen